

party the ability to decrypt the information being sent. Therefore, one skilled in the art would not look to Gennaro for teaching increased document protection.

The Office action asserts that Gennaro in combination with Jakobsson and Menezes teaches all the features recited in independent claims 1, 6 and 13. However, the combination of the applied references do not teach or suggest "performing a proxy transformation on the partially rendered, partially encrypted document using the proxy key; and decrypting the proxy transformed, partially rendered, partially encrypted document using the session key," as recited in claim 1 and 13 and similarly in claim 6.

The Office Action concedes Gennaro does not teach the features partially encrypted and proxy key and relies on Jakobsson to make up for this deficiency. Jakobsson, at col. 6, lines 19-27 and col. 10, lines 1-16, teaches different servers performing one partial decryption and one partial encryption simultaneously by merging the decrypting and encrypting operations into one operation. Therefore, by merging the decrypting and encrypting operations into one operation, Jakobsson does not teach "performing a proxy transformation on the partially rendered, partially encrypted document using the proxy key; and decrypting the proxy transformed, partially rendered, partially encrypted document using the session key," as recited in claim 1 and 13 and similarly in claim 6.

Furthermore, Applicant asserts that Gennaro, Jakobsson and Menezes, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for using a partially encrypted document including at least a proxy key and a session key, wherein the proxy key and the session key may be used to decrypt the partially encrypted document as part of the session rendering process only, as recited in independent claims 1 and 13 and similarly recited in independent claim 6.

Menezes, in col. 31, lines 38-41, merely discloses a system for controlling communications between a first and second facsimile machine, where following decoding

and decryption the system passes the decoded data file to any required renderers. Menezes decrypts the data before rendering occurs, and thus, Menezes fails to disclose or suggest a method to decrypt the partially decrypted document as part of the session rendering process, as recited in independent claims 1 and 13, and similarly recited in independent claim 6.

Additionally, Gennaro is silent regarding any rendering, and therefore, does not make up for the deficiencies of Jakobsson and Menezes.

For at least the above reasons, Gennaro, Jakobsson and Menezes cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 1, 6 and 13. Further, claims 2-5 and 7-12 would also not have been suggested by the applied references for at the least the respective dependence of these claims on allowable claims 1, 6 and 13, respectively, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recite.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the subject matter of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-13 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Tiffany J. Brooks
Registration No. 57,912

JAO:TJB

Date: October 11, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
